



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,032	05/31/2007	Yoshitugi Hashiba	MIYG.0003	2346
7590 Stanley P. Fisher REED SMITH LLP 3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400 Falls Church, VA 22042			EXAMINER DURAND, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT 3721	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/05/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/567,032

Applicant(s)

HASHIBA ET AL.

Examiner

PAUL R. DURAND

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/19/2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied (US 3,269,079) in view of Jones (US 5,682,758) in further view of Wild et al. (US 6,364,090).

In claims 7 and 11-13, Schmied discloses the invention as claimed including heating device 61, charging/filling device 21, sealing device 11 and subsequent cooling of the package by air (see figure 1 and col. 2, line 47 - col. 3, line19).

What Schmied does not disclose is the use of a cooling device which supports the package during cooling. However, Jones teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a cooling device 18, which cools a product 28, while being supported on a conveyor against gravity (see figure 1 and col. 4, lines 26-34). Furthermore, Wild teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a supporting surface 3, comprised of freestanding plates 4, which support bags 2 having a sealed area 2b for the purpose of transporting a package in an upright position prior to packaging (see figure 1 and col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 17).

Moreover, while the combination of Schmied does not disclose the use of a granular object having adsorption properties, the claims are drawn to an apparatus and as such, must be distinguished over the prior art in terms of structure and not the article worked upon by the apparatus. *See generally* MPEP § 2115.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Schmied with the cooling means as taught by Jones and the conveying support means as taught by Wild for the purpose of cooling a heated packaged product to an ambient temperature.

3. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied, Jones and Wild in view of McElvy (US 4,563,862).

In claim 8, the modified invention of Schmied discloses the invention as claimed and as applied to claim 7 above except for the use of a pinch mechanism. However, McElvy teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packaging to provide a pinching mechanism comprised of members 40, which engage a package "P" prior to sealing for the purpose of removing the air from a package (see figures 1-6 and col. 7, lines 3-14)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified invention of Schmied with the pinch means as taught by McElvy removing the air from a package as well as contaminants from a seal area.

In claim 12, the modified invention of Schmied, through Wild teaches that it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a supporting surface 3, comprised of freestanding plates 4, which support bags 2 having a sealed area 2b for the purpose of transporting a package in an upright position prior to packaging (see figure 1 and col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 17).

4. Claims 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied and Jones in view of Tramposch et al. (US 6,131,368).

In claims 9 and 10, the modified invention of Schmied discloses the invention as claimed and as applied to claim 7 above except for the heating range of 55-80 degrees C. However, Tramposch teaches that it is old and well known in the art to heat an adsorption material to a temperature between 40-90 degrees C for the purpose of preventing an oxidizing surface on the material (see col. 4, line 53 - col. 5, line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified invention of Schmied with the heating range as taught by Tramposch for the purpose of preventing an oxidizing surface on the material.

In claim 13, the modified invention of Schmied, through Wild teaches that it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a supporting surface 3, comprised of freestanding plates 4, which support bags 2 having a sealed area 2b for the purpose of transporting a package in an upright position prior to packaging (see figure 1 and col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 17).

5. Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied and Jones in view of Tramposch et al. (US 6,131,368).

In claims 14-21, the modified invention of Schmied discloses the invention as claimed including packaging an object utilizing heating and cooling according to the apparatuses claimed in claims 7-13. What, the modified invention of Schmied does not disclose is the use of a granular object having adsorption properties. However,

Tramposch teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a method of heating a granular object having adsorption properties, placing the granules in a storage bag, sealing the bag and cooling the bag to form a packaged product for the purpose of packaging a product susceptible to outside contamination (see col. 3, line 29 - col. 4, line 16 and col. 8, lines 28-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified invention of Schmied with the adsorption packaging process as taught by Tramposch.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL R. DURAND whose telephone number is (571)272-4459. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PAUL R. DURAND/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721
November 5, 2009